



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D C 20463

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Rickey Jamerson
3859 Sullivan Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63107

DEC 06 2000

RE: MUR 4985

Dear Mr. Jamerson:

On March 13, 2000, the Federal Election Commission received your complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act").

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against the respondents. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on October 25, 2000. This matter will become part of the public record within 30 days.

The Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeff S. Jordan", is written over a circular embossed seal.

Jeff S. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

MUR 4985
DOOLEY FOR CONGRESS

Rickey Jamerson alleged that Charlie A. Dooley's committee, Dooley for Congress ("the Committee"), may have accepted prohibited funds when it accepted four state/local candidate committees' contributions. Mr. Jamerson was concerned that McCullough for Prosecutor Committee, Shalowitz for State Senate Committee, Citizens for Buzz Westfall Committee, and Normandy Township Regular Democratic Club may have accepted funds from national banks, corporations or labor organizations. Mr. Jamerson also alleged that one respondent may have made an excessive \$1,000 contribution and that the Committee failed to itemize occupation and employer information for two contributors on the 1999 Year End Report. Also alleged in the complaint was that one contributor apparently exceeded her \$1,000 per election contribution limitation by \$1,000.

Howard Shalowitz responded on behalf of his committee that out of the \$80,000 raised for his 1998 State Senate campaign only \$6,000 remained and was transferred to the 2002 State Senate committee. It was the 2002 committee that made the \$500 contribution to Dooley. Mr. Shalowitz stated that although the 1998 state committee accepted contributions "from labor organizations, a couple of national banks, and corporations," those funds were the first in, first out during the 1998 campaign and were gone when the 2002 campaign made the Dooley contribution.

Normandy Township responded that "nearly all funds collected came from individuals." It was Normandy's belief that the contribution made to Dooley was permissible. The McCullough and Westfall Committees stated that they had enough funds from individuals to cover the amount contributed to Dooley.

Dooley responded that all the contributions from the four state/local committees were "allowable under federal law." The Committee further stated that it used its best efforts to identify occupation and employer information and that the apparent excessive contribution was simply a clerical error. The Committee replied that \$1,000 should have been noted as being for the primary and \$1,000 for the general. The Rylls, who contributed this amount, responded and explained this allocation and their occupations.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.